

7 copies

Re Mrs. S

Deposited by David Thompson

(1.)
47

105.1753

DT pl

Trenton, N.J.

September 7. 1926.

Timothy Newell Pfeiffer, Esq.
120 Broadway.
New York City.

Dear Sir:-

On my arrival at Trenton, I called at Mr. Wicoff's office but learned that he was in Newark, N.J. I saw him late this afternoon and he informed me that he had been talking to you over the phone and had already ordered the certified copies of papers in question. He wrote you while I was at his office.

I spoke to Mr. Wicoff about arranging so that I could read over the various papers in the action. He thought it best to wait until later for the reason that they were in the hands of one of the copyists at present. He informed me that he had examined same and that the only information which might be of value, was that contained in the petition for divorce. This shows that the marriage took place on October 13. 1890; that thereafter plaintiff and defendant resided in the City of Paterson until February 16. 1892 at which time

they moved to Jersey City remaining there until June 3. 1894 at which time they separated. Plaintiff charged that defendant had been guilty of acts of adultery with one Harry Ray at 602 First Street, Hoboken, N. J. during the months of October and November 1896. John H. Boon of Union Hill, N. J. represented the plaintiff and Collins & Corbin of Jersey City was for the defendant. The case was tried before Vice Chancellor Pitney at Jersey City on November 8. 1897 and he found defendant guilty of the acts charged and accordingly a decree was granted. There are no minutes of the trial with the papers in the case and we are endeavoring to ascertain who the stenographer was at that time.

I saw Chief County Detective James S. Kirkham at the Prosecutors office and we made a search for the papers in the Lewella Marshall case. Up to closing time the file had not been located. I am to meet him again in the morning and continue the search.

Kirkham claims that at the time of the Marshall case, the Prosecutor's office did not make a practice of taking written

statements from witnesses^{and} is positive that none were taken.

There was a man named William Attsenhoeffer who was charged with the murder. The case was presented to the January, 1913 Grand Jury^{and} they failed to indict. There is just a possibility that Mrs. Easton's name may appear on the back of the information as one of the witnesses. I do not think that any attempt is being made to conceal the papers in question as all papers for the year 1913 are together^{and} none of them as yet have been found.

Kirkham says that he was acquainted with Mrs. Easton; that he has talked to her on various occasions but does not recall what connection, if any, she had with the Marshall case. While he says that he has nothing in particular on which to base his statement, he would not take her word to even convict a yellow dog.

He says of his own knowledge, that Mrs. Easton was never arrested. but is under the impression that the Prosecutor's office received complaints about her conducting a disorderly house. While he would not swear positively, the best of his

recollection is that he told her that complaints had been received and if any further reports came in. her place would be raided and she would be arrested.

Further report for to-day will follow as I desire to get this one in the 10 P.M. mail.

Respectfully yours.

David Thompson.